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The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held June 10, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)
Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla) arrived 1:27
Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC) departed 1:32
Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) arrived 1:11
Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC) departed 1:32
Councillor Nathan Small (CLC) arrived 1:08, departed 1:53

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)
Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)

**STAFF PRESENT:** Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
Sharon Nebbia (MPO staff)

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)
Chris Mydock (NMDPS)
Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. **CALL TO ORDER (1:05 p.m.)**

Flores: its five minutes after one so I’m going to go ahead and call this meeting to order. Do we need to have a roll call?

Wray: Yes.

Flores: Okay.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Here.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Here.
Wray: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Here.

Wray: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Here.

Wray: Madam Chair.

Flores: Okay, so, here. And we have a quorum. Okay so we have a quorum.

Wray: Yes. Sorry.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee Member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the Committee.

Flores: Conflict of interest inquiry.

Wray: A noise distracted me.

Flores: Okay. Does any Committee member have any known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee member may recuse themselves from voting on any specific matter, or if they feel that they can be impartial we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of the committee.

NO CONFLICT.

Flores: Okay.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment

4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Flores: So we’ll move on to the Consent Agenda. Do I have a motion?

Garrett: So moved.

Flores: Okay. Commissioner Garrett has moved to approve the Consent Agenda.

Pedroza: Second.
Sorg: I’ll...

Flores: There was a second by both Olga Pedroza and, and, and Gill Sorg but we’ll go ahead and go with Councilor Pedroza. She was first. Okay.

Wray: Oh, Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes.

Wray: We’ve skipped over a public comment.

Flores: Oh. I’m sorry. I did and, and there’s actually somebody in the public that wants to comment. So, sorry, so moving back to public comment. Is there anyone from the public that would like to come up and please do, please come forward and state your name for the record? And welcome.

Thurston: Thank you. My name is Ken Thurston and I wanted to appear before the MPO today to ask for a change in the MPO Road Specifications as it relates to Taylor Road from Elks to El Camino and Lopez Road from Elks, it’s to El Camino also. And not knowing exactly how to approach this organization we decided to show up today and see if we could have public input on those two items.

Flores: Okay.

Thurston: We own the land, approximately 158 acres. We are trying to do the development. We have met with the City and the County staff and we’re basically being told that the process we need to meet before the MPO and present our case and ask for the variance or a change of road definition in, on those two roads relating to our property.

Flores: Oh, so you need to ask for a variance or a change in the definition...

Murphy: Correct.

Flores: Of the road.

Thurston: And then we can take this to the ETZ and you know go through and meet the requirements, but without a change on those two roads they’re just telling us that, “Look this is the way it is and this is the way it’s going to be.” And we do not agree with the right-of-way or the, because of the housing situation to the west and to the east, we are saying that that’s not logical and so we’re asking to be heard here and ask for that variance.

Sorg: Madam Chair.
Flores: Yes.

Sorg: I, thank you Madam Chair. I have a little history with this. I, I'm aware of what's going on. I think it would be helpful for the, the Policy Committee to get a little history of this particular road, why it was designated as it was and, and then we could make a better decision as to what to do here.

Flores: Okay.

Pedroza: Madam Chair.

Garrett: Madam Chair.

Flores: Actually first let me just say I don't think we're going to make any decision today. I just wanted to hear what he had to say and maybe make a decision on whether we want to invite him back and put him on the agenda or if we'll decide that maybe Mr. Murphy can help him out and there's a Plan B, but go ahead. I'm sorry to interrupt you …

Garrett: That was what I was going to suggest, Madam Chair.

Flores: Okay.

Pedroza: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: I, I, I'm totally in agreement with that but I would also like to know exactly to, what kind of change it is that you're requesting and why, either now or when, when it's scheduled to be heard.

Thurston: Is there a way to pull up the actual designation currently?

Garrett: Madam Chair.

Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: It'd be helpful if we could also get the description of the, the specific roads again.

Flores: Okay, of which roads that he wants to have changed from what, from what points...

Thurston: Okay.
Flores: Is that what you’re asking? Okay. If you could repeat the, what you want to have altered and that...

Thurston: Okay. I’m assuming you’re seeing what I’m seeing...

Flores: Yes. We all have computers with it.

Thurston: On your screen here. So if you look on the Taylor Road where it crosses El Camino Real and goes east to Elks and then Lopez where it goes from El Camino up to Zertuche to Elks. Those are the two roads. Several years ago the County asked for the right-of-way on Taylor Road. At the time they wanted a 60-foot right-of-way and that’s what they received and then the road was put in to make the connection and now they’re, you’re, the MPO is requiring it to be I think an 80, no they want that one to be 100-foot and Lopez to be 85-foot. We are asking for a 60-foot to stay the same on Taylor and Lopez to stay, or to be required at a 60-foot and that’s why we’re here today. And I agree with the two inputs. We just need to know how to get before the Board and then what the process is and if you’re going to tell me to take this back through Tom, I’m glad to do that and then come before the August meeting.

Flores: Right. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you Madam Chair and, and I think it would be helpful also to have whatever input we need from the County staff and, and any other relevant, I mean because it would be posted as an item for discussion or potentially for action, we need to make sure that other relevant parties are, are also informed.

Flores: Okay.

Thurston: I agree.

Flores: So are we deciding to go ahead and put this on the agenda and have more information for discussion and then we can put it as an action item if we decide to choose from that point?

Murphy: Madam Chair, we can do that. I would also, I'd also recommend that we do take it through at least the Technical Advisory Committee so that, that, that’s, that’s really our point of contact with County staff, with City staff, DOT staff, and then...

Flores: And...

Murphy: They, they’re an advisory committee to, to this body as you know. I would take it to their August meeting prior to your, to your August meeting.
Flores: That, that was my question. Do they have a July meeting or do they also not have a, okay. All right. And they’re, they meet prior to us.

Murphy: Yes they do. They meet, meet the first Thursday of each month.

Flores: And at this point can you...

Murphy: Except for July.

Flores: Say that their agenda is full or that they would have room to put, add this to the agenda?

Murphy: We have room for it.

Flores: Okay. All right. So, and are you going to allow him to come to that meeting then and give him the time so that he’ll, Mr. ...

Murphy: Absolutely. It’s an open public meeting.

Flores: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Thurston: Thank you.

Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Madam Chair. I just, I just want to make sure, do we have any precedent in terms of, of dealing with this kind of request before? Is there a specific process that we should be following?

Murphy: There, there are a couple ways of, of doing, of, of achieving what Mr. Thurston is asking for. One, and, and what I believe his request today is to amend the, the Transportation Plan to show that those particular roadways have different right-of-ways. Two, and this, this will go, this would go through the, the EDRC is to request a waiver to those, to those standards. MPO staff has met with Mr. Thurston and, and we advised him that you know under certain conditions we would support his request of the waiver if he were to go through that process and, and MPO staff is a voting member on the EDRC Committee. Although I, also I think conditionally though I think with the, I'll have to check procedures but I think the EDRC Committee recommendation has to be ratified by the Planning and Zoning Committee for, for that particular jurisdiction being the ETA. But there are two ways of achieving that and we had, it, I, I do not know if he’s pursuing the second one but the, the latter one which goes through this body is certainly something we can schedule and, and
hearing through if for any reason he, he’s, fails in the, in the waiver process through the EDRC.

Garrett: Okay. Madam Chair I, I think it’s important that if this is going to come through to the, the MPO Policy Committee that we have full, as much background as we can in terms of why the current designation is the way that it is and then what the implications are of making the change in, in terms of what the standards are and what the rationale for the standards are so that we actually, we’ve got a couple of months so it’d be good to have that as a whole package for consideration when it eventually gets to us in, in August.

Flores: Absolutely, I mean I, one of our problems in Mesilla is University, we don’t have enough room on University and it’s causing all sorts of problems with our school area and so, definitely. Yes. Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: If Commissioner Garrett is finished, I just have a couple questions on this one. We’re talking about the difference between an arterial and a collector, are we not?

Murphy: Madam Chair, Councilor Sorg. I think we can, and we certainly could entertain anyway, anywhere from a, you know dropping them down to a local through keeping you know an arterial. As you see on the screen Taylor is a minor arterial and Lopez is designated as a collector. Per the County Design Standards, the minor arterials require 100 feet of right-of-way.

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: And collectors require 85 feet of right-of-way but again as I stated there is a, there is an administrative process through the EDRC that can relieve some of that burden.

Sorg: Yes. All right. The second question I have, I couldn’t help but notice on the map this black dotted square going over Interstate 25. Does that indicate, and I might refer to the DOT on this that there is planned in the future an underpass of, of I-25 for Taylor Road?

Murphy: I, I can answer that. Back in ...

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: The 1990s the, the MPO and the, with at the time the Highway Department undertook a, the Interstate Highway Access System Study or IHAS and among many it, it, it did eventually call for an underpass at Taylor Road. So we have not developed at the, at the pace that was
anticipated at that, at that point in time so it doesn’t need to you know we, we don’t anticipate it in the up, you know in the upcoming Transportation Plan horizon but it is something that, that has been studied and recommended in the past and is you know subject, subject to be drawn in.

Sorg: Okay. At this moment it’s still the same as it was suggested or, or planned in the, in the ’90s then.

Murphy: It, it is. It is.

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: It does exist in the planning document.

Sorg: Okay. Would that be part of your presentation on, in August then?

Murphy: Yes. That would ...

Sorg: To ...

Murphy: Be part of the background.

Sorg: To give us that. Okay. Thank you very much Madam Chair. Thank you Mr. Murphy.

Flores: Okay. Thank you. All right. So moving along back to the consent agenda we have motions. I don’t believe we’ve voted on this so ...

Wray: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes. Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Garrett.
Garrett: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Small.

Small: Yes.

Wray: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes. Okay so that looks like that’s passed.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5.1 *May 13, 2015 – Minutes approved under the consent agenda vote.

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 *Resolution 15-06: A Resolution Authorizing the MPO Officer to Sign a Memorandum of Agreement with NMDOT Transit and Rail Division

Flores: And we’ll move on to Action Items, 6.1, Resolution 15-06: A Resolution Authorizing the MPO Officer to Sign a Memorandum of Agreement with New Mexico Department of Transportation Transit and Rail Division.

Barraza: Madam Chair.

Sorg: Move to approve.

Barraza: Oh, I think that’s on the Consent Agenda.

Flores: Oh, you’re right. It’s got a little star here. Sorry.

6.2 Resolution 15-07: A Resolution Adopting the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

Flores: So we’ll move to 6.2, Resolution 15-07: A Resolution Adopting the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program.

Sorg: Move to approve.

Flores: Okay. Just now with ...

Barraza: I second.

Flores: Okay.
Barraza: I will second.

Flores: And you have a, Mayor Barraza seconding that. The motion to approve was, what was the first one from? Who did the first motion?

Murphy: Councilor Sorg.

Flores: Councilor Sorg, okay. I will note that we have the airport, he’s not here this time but at the last meeting Commissioner Hancock was saying that he would prefer not to have the airport information included. Is this the same one? Yes.

Wray: Madam Chair, that, that portion starts on page 60 of the packet, just if anyone wants to look at it.

Flores: Page 60 or page 43?

Wray: The airport portion starts on page 60.

Flores: Oh. Okay, I see what you’re saying. Sixty. So...

Sorg: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes.

Sorg: I would just like to point out the roll on the actual resolution is a couple years old, has Chair Thomas and Vice-Chair Krahling. I believe that’s the one we’re on now, ’08. Oh, that was ’08.

Flores: Oh, this one’s, this one looks updated.

Wray: Councilor Sorg, what page are you looking at? If, I mean if, we’ll definitely get that corrected.

Sorg: It’s 82. But I guess it’s not this resolution. I thought it was this resolution, I got it, otherwise.

Flores: We’ll just hold it for the next, okay.


Wray: Oh. So it does. We’ll get that corrected when we get to that point.

Flores: At this point we’ve got, there are a few, there are quite a few little issues with the Las Cruces airport and basically Commissioner Hancock had said
that he would prefer to keep it out since it’s not really, we don’t really have control over it. My view is that I’m fine keeping it there as long as it’s not overly taxing on staff and just to have it available for the public so that they can see it if they happen to, to look at our thing or to have a site referring where they can get the information. So does anybody else have any other opinions?

Sorg: I have an opinion.

Flores: Okay. Commissioner, Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: I believe transportation includes air, airplanes and so forth so I think it has to be in here. What does our MOU with the DOT and so forth say?

Wray: Madam Chair, Councilor Sorg. The airport, the so-called airport TIP is not required by NMDOT. It is something that was included at the behest of previous policy committees. The airport operates under the FAA which doesn’t have a TIP process.

Sorg: I see.

Wray: So it, it’s something that, that, that this MPO has done historically for many, many years but it’s not required by any other body other than, than this Committee.

Sorg: It doesn’t have to be part of the resolution, in other words.

Wray: I think that it would be best if staff had some affirmative direction from the Committee as to whether or not to include it in the future so if you want to.

Sorg: It’s up to us then.

Wray: Yes. It is up to you.

Sorg: Okay.

Doolittle: Madam Chair.

Flores: So, so are you staying with the, you would like it there or not like it there? Why don’t I, why don’t I propose we just take a, a vote for people that want it in and those that don’t want it in and, and I’ll let Mr. Doolittle make a comment and Olga, they both want to comment. Go ahead Mr. ...

Doolittle: I, I think I just have one question or one clarification from the last meeting. Regardless of, I guess my concern is right now it’s in with the action items and regardless of whether we decide to agree or disagree with what’s in
these tied to the, to the airport it’s going, it’s going to happen regardless.
So I think my concern is I’d like to see the information as an informational
issue but I don’t know that it should be an action item because it, it doesn’t
really matter what we decide as a body.

Flores: Well the action being whether or not we put it into our documents so I’m
saying we ought to just say, “We’re just listing this. This isn’t something
we have control over. We’re just listing this as a courtesy.” You know.

Doolittle: But should it then be taken, right now it is part of our action item so should
we take it, should we separate it from the things that we’re voting on as an
action item?

Wray: The, the Committee may amend the, the document; however, it sees fit so
if you would like to ...

Flores: Do you have any suggested wording then? I mean ...

Doolittle: Well, well can it, can it be separated and be included in either the
committee or staff comments or the discussion items for future reference
and take that portion specifically out of the action item? I don’t want to
make it too difficult but it seems kind of odd that we’re voting on an item
that, that we have no authority over anyway.

Flores: Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Madam Chair. For the, for the purposes of this action item I, I think that
we would move to, to amend the attachment by deleting those pages 60
on to the, on to the end of the document and then you can vote on the, on
the resolution as, as amended and then you can give us, you know once
we get to the staff comments you can give us direction to find another
place on the website in which to publish that information.

Flores: Okay. Could we then have a little portion saying where it, where it is that
they can find that? All right. Does that sound satisfactory and, and does
Councilor Pedroza still want, want to make a comment?

Pedroza: I wanted to ask and I think my question has been answered whether
there’s any benefit to, to us to, to have it ...

Flores: Yes.

Pedroza: In here but if it’s not, it’s going to happen regardless of what we want and
it’s not our decision then I think the solution has been suggested possibly,
just right.
Flores: Actually Mr. Murphy does have a comment about that.

Murphy: Yes Madam Chair, Councilor Pedroza. It, it did, it did prove beneficial in, in one time in the past when the City was seeking funds to build the fire station out there and they showed that it was included on the MPO’s TIP. It, it aided them in getting a grant. I’m not saying it was, was the deciding factor but they did, did cite that it was helpful that we did have that information.

Pedroza: Do you think that our including it as a separate section just simply saying that whatever it is that you suggest that we were going to be saying, that it’s there and we’re aware of it, would that be sufficient or the same kind of thing if it arises in the future?

Murphy: If something like that arises in the future they could say, cite that it’s in the City’s CIP and that’s probably adequate. I think the main, you know apart from that one example, I think the main benefit of this is, is that you know just dissemination of information ...

Pedroza: Okay.

Murphy: To the public.

Pedroza: Okay.

Murphy: So from, from a staff perspective either way works.

Pedroza: All right. Thank you very much.

Flores: I just have one more clarification. We, we have rail on here but it’s the same situation except that we’re required to put rail, is that correct?

Wray: NMDOT has, has rail jurisdiction so that falls under the umbrella of NMDOT.

Flores: But we, but we still give the information on our TIP even though it’s their ...

Wray: It, it’s the, it, it ...

Flores: They make the decisions.

Wray: The TIP is a, is a NMDOT and FHWA required document and since rail is under that, those projects are required to go on the TIP.

Flores: All right. But we’re not really making the decisions on rail is what, right?
Wray: Well it, as the MPO this Committee can but the, the rail projects go on the TIP. They’re, they’re part of the TIP whereas the airport is not.

Flores: Is not. Okay. All right. Okay so is that clear as mud so have we decided to basically pull it and, say, is that, I’m getting a shaking head, is anybody opposed to that? No. Okay. So that’s what we’ll do, okay at your direction. Anybody else have any comments on the TIP? Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: I went through and I do have some questions. On page 46 the I-10 mill and outlay, inlay rather, sorry about that. Where, where is mile post 146 to mile post six, 164?

Doolittle: Councilor Sorg. That is from the I-10/I-25 interchange to the Texas state line.

Sorg: Okay.

Doolittle: So that’s the six, that’s the entire six-lane portion.

Sorg: Right. Then I see a scheduled, the intersection of Spitz, Solano, Three Crosses and, and Highway 70/Main Street scheduled for this coming year, 2016. Is that calendar year or fiscal year?

Doolittle: That would be fiscal year.

Sorg: Is that a federal fiscal year or local fiscal year?

Doolittle: Federal fiscal year.

Sorg: Okay. I’m just going to make a comment, is all. Being that Main Street has been tied up for so long, maybe it’s a little too soon to get, start ripping up another portion of it so close to there. But you do what you have to do. The next one is on Valley Drive.

Flores: Could you tell us the page number?

Sorg: This is page 51.

Flores: Okay.

Sorg: The Highway 188 road construction. I see that’s pushed off until Fiscal Year 2017. And I’m just going to make a comment that it’s a shame that isn’t done a little sooner but it is what it is. Next is Highway 70 on page 53. The, this is a safety project I, I believe HSIP? Yeah. Where is that, 162 to 170?
Doolittle: Councilor Sorg. That’s basically the safety project to allow for bicycle facilities over the pass from Organ to about to, is it going all the way to White Sands? All the way to White Sands.

Sorg: Wow. Okay, very good. Then I think the rest are all RoadRUNNER projects. Okay, I have one last question. We’ve, we’ve briefly mentioned this in the past but where does the interchange of Triviz and Elks and Main Street come in for the, for, for doing it over?

Wray: That project is on page 54.

Sorg: Oh, it’s University.

Wray: Oh, sorry. Sorry. Sorry. Never mind. That ...

Sorg: University.

Wray: One’s not in there. Sorry.

Sorg: Okay.

Wray: I was thinking.

Sorg: I know.

Wray: I heard Triviz and was like, “Oh, well no it’s down there.”

Sorg: Yeah. Right.

Doolittle: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Doolittle: That project itself is currently not in our, in our STIP. We are currently, we actually had a meeting this morning. We’re currently seeking funding to do a study basically from the Three Crosses interchange to the I-25 interchange so that we can justify, you know does it need six lanes through there? You know how wide does the bridge need to be? What do we need to do at the Elks intersection? So ultimately right now we’re in the planning, or in the study phase. Again, we’re seeking that funding. Actually I think we’re going to have it awarded in August, correct?

Sorg: Award the study ...

Doolittle: We’re working on an RFP that will go out in August to conduct the study.
Sorg: Okay.

Doolittle: Then once we have that then we’ll have the ammunition to pursue some additional funding and have an idea of what it would take to, to improve that in, that last section from Three Crosses to the I-25 interchange.

Sorg: Okay, very good. Just one last word on that. Does the words “traffic circle” ever come up when you’re doing these studies?

Doolittle: Yes and no.

Sorg: Okay.

Doolittle: I, I, I’m sure it will be part of the discussion but we’ll just have to wait and see what the RFP comes up with and ...

Sorg: Okay.

Doolittle: Let it run through its, through its phase. Actually that’s a Phase A through, A through D study. It is a complete study.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: Okay. Anyone else? So ...

Small: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes, Councilor Little (Small).

Small: Yes and thank you Madam Chair. Briefly, just to, the, Councilor Sorg brings up some great points. For Valley Drive and I’ve said it before, I want to again thank DOT, Molzen Corbin, and other partners who have produced the first of its kind public interactive website, fully interactive public meetings one of which was just last week. We’ve gotten a lot of great input. The public comment period ends on June 30th for, which is narrowing those initial phases so it’s certainly been very educational to me to learn and to experience first-hand on such an important roadway corridor exactly how much planning and how much lead time go into these. Further I would point out that there’s been a great deal of interest for Option F which folks can see if they go to valleydrive.net and that one has received a great deal of positive feedback and I think well warranted because of its promotion of reinvestment, the extra facilities for bike and pedestrian, and similarities to something on the order of Triviz which would be, a great addition to that part of the city. So it does take a long time, it will be a very complicated project but I really do emphasize the
thank-yous to the folks who are involved and we have a short amount of
time to make sure that we get everything right before the, goes on to the
next phase.

Flores: When did you say the last day for public comment was?

Small: Thank you Madam Chair. Yes. It's June the 30th.

Flores: June 30th. Okay. Thank you.

Small: Yes. Exactly. Thank you very much. Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: So is that all the comments that we had, are we ready to take a vote?

Pedroza: There's one more Madam Chair.

Flores: Okay. Sorry.

Pedroza: I'd like to get some reassurance and it's probably not even necessary but
I've been reading in the paper that the state is, is considering calling back
some funds if they have not been spent and so are we in any danger of
losing any of our state funding for, for any of our road projects?

Wray: As far as I know no.

Pedroza: Okay. That's what I needed. But you will look into it.

Wray: We, we certainly do our best to keep on top of it.

Pedroza: Okay. Thank you.

Flores: All right.

Wray: We need to amend the existing motion to delete pages.

Flores: Oh that's right. Okay.

Wray: 60 through 76.

Flores: So, so do I have a motion to amend, to delete the pages having to do with
the airport?

Pedroza: So moved.

Flores: Okay. And do I hear ...
Garrett: Second.

Flores: Second by Commissioner Garrett. First motion by Councilor Pedroza. Okay. All in favor?

Wray: Should we do a roll call for that?

Flores: Okay.

Wray: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Small.

Small: Yes.

Wray: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes. Okay.

Wray: And now for the main ...

Flores: Okay, and so going back to the motion.

Wray: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.
Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
Doolittle: Yes.
Wray: Councilor Sorg.
Sorg: Yes.
Wray: Commissioner Garrett.
Garrett: Yes.
Wray: Councilor Small.
Small: Yes.
Wray: Madam Chair.
Flores: Yes. Okay. So that's passed.

6.3 Resolution 15-08: A resolution Adopting the 2015-2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Transport 2040)

Flores: Let's go to 6.3, Resolution 15-08: A Resolution Adopting the 2015-2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Wray: Thank you Madam Chair. MPO staff is pleased to bring this before you today. This is the culmination of over two years' worth of work. This is the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. This will be kind of the flagship document of the MPO that you're adopt, that you're, is before you today. Just to give a brief background of the current Transport 2040 that was adopted in July of 2010, we do want to highlight a couple of the accomplishments: The adoption of the MPO Access Management Guidelines, the adoption last year of the Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan, and also want to highlight the completion of the Mesilla Valley Intermodal Transit Terminal during that, during that time frame.

As I said this has been a, a two-plus year process. In addition to the public involvement dates that you see listed on the screen before you, MPO staff has also reached out to such organizations as the Ocotillo Institute, the American Civil Engineering Companies, we've had multiple meetings with the Chambers of Commerce and we've also had multiple work sessions with both of the Advisory Committees as well as having
offered this Committee multiple opportunities to comment on the document.

I’m not going to go into detail on the content of the chapters today as everyone has, as we’ve already done that multiple times in the past but I do want to highlight that in Chapter 4, that’s where we have included the performance measures that are required by Map 21. They are at this time kind of a, a skeletal base to build from but we have included safety, safety measures that are one of the things that we know that FHWA is going to be looking for going forward. We also, and there will be a presentation about the Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan as well but we’ve also been working with DOT to make sure that performance measures are going to be lining up across the board on, on all levels.

Additionally, Chapter 6, the financial section of the document was also one of the ones that received extensive revision during the writing process. Now while we were doing the research and, and gathering the public input for this document there were a couple of key factors that presented themselves to us. One is that population growth rate in Dona Ana County and in New Mexico at large is slowing down. I can see this myself in the work that I do for the MPO on the development review side. There are fewer cases now, distinctly fewer cases now than there were in the past when I started with the MPO. Additionally VMT has peaked and is in a process of going through a slight decline as you can see on the graph in the lower left. The MPO staff, in all of our research we have seen nothing to indicate that that trend is going to reverse any time soon so that is a factor that we have incorporated into the recommendations that we’ve made in the document. On a, a sort of national scale obviously you all are aware that the, one of the major impacts of this is the gas tax is both going down and not able to pay for as much.

During our public input process as well as the writing process MPO staff sort of coalesced the principles that you see there on the screen. Again we worked closely with NMDOT, with the City of Las Cruces and their Sustainability Program, with Viva Dona Ana, with a number of different stakeholders and groups to make sure that our goals were going to be in alignment with the goals of the other organizations both regionally and across the state. I do want to point out and highlight that the most fundamental aspect of the plan is that it calls for the maintenance and, and improving of the existing transportation system first before any expansion is considered. We also want to make sure that the transportation network is connecting people with jobs and goods and services that they need and is also preserving the natural, cultural, historical, and agricultural resources and is also following good healthy and livability practices. Also again, the last principle there is one of the performance measures specifically called for by FHWA is that we increase safety and that safety, safety be one of our key priorities.

Again this is the list of the specific recommendations that are in the document. Again the fix, it first prioritized maintenance above highway
expansion, support ITS, and invest in public transit. Those are ways of increasing the capacity of the existing network without expansion. We also wish to, on an MPO level we wish to continue to develop the Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan to better target public funding and also to improve our knowledge base of the infrastructure that is within the MPO area and also hopefully utilize that to target maintenance and better plan for, for those purposes. We also wish to invest more in relatively inexpensive projects such as bicycle, pedestrian, and public transit improvements and we also would like, the plan calls for consideration of reducing roadway widths so that the transportation system is less expensive to maintain going forward.

Now the Technical Advisory Committee reviewed this document last Thursday at their June 4th meeting and recommended approval. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee reviewed the document and recommended approval at their May 9th meeting, or May 19th meeting, excuse me. These are the actions that the Policy Committee may take of the document today. You may adopt it as is. There also may be some changes that you would like for, to see incorporated that can be done fairly quickly or you may send us back with some revisions that you would like us to do before we bring it back to you. And that concludes my presentation. I will stand now for any questions.

Flores: Anyone have any questions or comments? Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: I have a comment. I read in the paper today that Las Cruces was recognized as a bronze level city in terms of bicycles usage or bicycle safety so congratulations.

Flores: Okay. All right. Anyone else? Councilor Small.

Small: Thank you Madam Chair. Thank you and it, it's, really falls in line with, with much great policy and, and again kudos to the staff developing it. One of the items and this was mentioned at a previous meeting, as far as not only in-roadway bicycle facilities but also PAS developed especially now that the state legislation was passed earlier this decade allowing for pedestrian and, and bicycle paths along the ditches, acequias, whatever we want to call them, does that, how does that figure in directly to this policy document? Is it too, too into the weeds or the dirt as it may be or is it in line and in there?

Wray: Madam Chair, Councilor Small. We didn’t bring the maps today because we felt that everyone had seen them a number of times already but trails would certainly be, we, in fact we do have trails on the Trail Plan. There is a Trail Plan map so anything like that would be included on our, on our documents.
Small: Understood. Thank you very much. Thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: Okay. Actually Councilor Sorg and then we’ll go with Commissioner Garrett so go ahead. Didn’t you say you wanted to make a comment?

Sorg: Yes. I'm having a hard time hearing. You're so close.

Flores: Okay.

Sorg: Yeah. Thank you staff for all this hard work that you did, all these public meetings and all, put, putting together with this plan. I, I just have to comment the fact that according to our recent citizen surveys the City has done, this plan looks to me like it’s right in line with the vast majority of the people here in, in, least in Las Cruces if not in the County. So congratulations.

Flores: Okay. Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you and, and actually I would say that based on the Viva Dona Ana effort that the, the plan is also fairly consistent with the, the values and, and interests that we’ve heard from the larger population throughout the County. You know I'm wanting to ask, probably Mr. Murphy. You’ve been working with the old plan, you’ve been looking at the new plan. This could actually come from any of the staff but I'd be interested in what you see as the most significant changes between the old plan and this update. You know if you were to highlight what things have, have emerged, and just an example I think has to do with the idea that we’re, we’re not, we’re not as committed to ring roads just as an example that we’re, we’re looking at filling in and fixing things and I mean there seem to be a number of important messages to the public and I'm just curious about whether you could summarize. I'm talking to give you a chance to collect your thoughts. But I think it’s important when we do these kinds of plans to be able to highlight what the changes are, not just what it is but how it’s different than what, what we’ve had in the past.

Murphy: Madam Chair, Commissioner Garrett. Thank you. I, I think the best way would be kind of, kind of contrast back you know looking back to the, the public comment we had here at the beginning of the meeting and the map that we brought up to look at that. Prior, I think prior to development of this plan people looked at the MPO products and they said, “Okay where, where’s the region going to grow, what direction, what are going to be the new roadways, what are we going to build?” I think that was, that was what everyone thought when they thought MPO and as Mr. Wray outlined in the, in the presentation I, we’re changing this document to more of a philosophy of fix it first and I think you know, and you know, if I you know may speak for Mr. Doolittle’s staff there I think for years they have been,
they have been focusing on the maintenance activities within the district
and it’s been a philosophy that the DOT has taken up. I know that you
know speaking with the, the County Engineering staff, they’re very
concerned with the condition, the City Public Works staff and
Transportation staff are very, very much concerned with it so I think finally
we’re getting a document that’s in line with what staff has experienced day
to day and so from a policy standpoint we’re saying that that’s our, our
number one priority at this point and I think that’s, that’s the real change
with this document over the previous document.

Garrett: Thank you. I, I would also say that, that I’m, I’m really struck by the, the
kind of grounding in multimodal so, bicycles just as an example. This isn’t
just about the, about cars and trucks. It’s, it’s much broader than that and
I think that that’s, that’s an important part of this, plus probably the
recognition of sort of the broader impact of working on our transportation
systems in terms of health and, and community development and
economic development. I mean there’s a lot more I think strength in terms
of understanding that and, and supporting that. So I think it’s a good
document, good step forward.

Flores: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Thank you Madam Chair and, and Tom and, and Commissioner Garrett. I
think I’d like to expand just a little bit on the maintenance portion. You
know I, I, I think that’s something we focused on for a long time but really
what we’ve been doing is we’ve been doing a lot of Band-Aids. So our,
our facilities are 50 years old, we come in, we take two inches off and we
put two inches back, and then in five to seven years we’re doing the exact
same thing again. And so I think this concept of maintaining what we
already have is going to take, is going to go a step further through our
Asset Management Program where you’re going to start seeing us doing
full reconstruction on some of our facilities, and that’s not really
maintenance but that truly is taking care of the facilities that we already
have. So I think you’re going to start seeing some, some more costly
projects, you’re going to see some shortened projects because of those
costs but that’s in an effort to truly try to fix and, and build the roadways
that are there rather than keep putting on these short-term Band-Aids, and
that’ll incorporate this, you know the statewide program, you know there’s
no way that our district can rebuild I-10 and I-25. It’s just not going to
happen. So I think this idea of a, of a statewide program where they really
focus on where the needs need to go, so I, I think this, this term of
“maintain” could be misconstrued a little bit because reconstruction is not
really maintenance but it is taking care of the facilities so I think you’re
going to see it go a step further than we’ve really, than we’ve really seen
in the past and that’s to the asset management and the performance
measures tied to, to Map 21 but Tom’s exactly right. I think you, you’re
going to see us spend a lot more money on our existing facilities to try to perform the, the, the tasks or the, the processes that should've been performed through the life of that project in order to get back on track.

Flores: Okay. Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Okay. Thank you Madam Chair. I just also reiterate what the others that have spoken prior to myself have said and the staff, just the outreach that you all have done in terms of the public, having your meetings with the public, listening, collaborating with different agencies and also with the different advisory committees that we have with the MPO. I think the staff has done an excellent job of outreaching to the public and all the stakeholders and they've had an opportunity to comment and I think you've been able to take those comments, incorporate them into this document what is best for this whole community so I, I, I'm very pleased with the document we have before us. Thank you.

Flores: Okay. Thank you. Councilor Sorg did you want to bring up the maintenance now on the signatures?

Sorg: Do we need an amendment for that?

Wray: I don't know that we need an amendment. We'll certainly get that corrected. That was just a ...

Sorg: Okay.

Flores: That seems to me like, as a ...

Wray: Complete oversight.

Sorg: From old documents some place.

Wray: Yeah.

Flores: Was part of what, four ...

Wray: Yeah, the, that was ...

Flores: That the MPO staff was hereby authorized to administratively update the transportation plan for spelling. I guess that's not necessarily this resolution. Okay.

Pedroza: Madam Chair.

Flores: Yes, Commissioner, or Councilor Pedroza.
Pedroza: Thank you Madam Chair. I wanted to, I may have at some point already in another one of our previous meetings mentioned but I, I read a book that was excellent and it touched on this and seems to be very, very important and I was very glad to read in the plan itself that you, that you talk about a very difficult process that we’re going to be having to address and by we I mean all of the elected officials of public bodies which is funding. The book that I read was Losing Our Way and I can’t tell you who the author is cause I can’t remember but he, well starts his book and it is not fiction, it’s a, fact, with the collapse of a bridge in I believe it was Montana?

Sorg: Minneapolis.

Pedroza: Minneapolis, Minnesota. And he does it in such a way that you’re horrified because he, he, he focuses on one particular woman who as a result of the collapse of the bridge is left paralyzed and the, the bridge collapsed on the day that she was going home to plan her wedding. So it is extremely moving. And then he says that you know everybody knew this bridge was needed, needed major repairs. So what I think we’re dealing with is that as, as Commissioner Doolittle says we have neglected and we’re going to have to find ways to, to catch up with all the things that we have left and so if it’s call, if we need to say it’s not just repair it’s reconstruction and we know that it has to be funded, then we’re going to have to address those really hard decisions of how do we fund it. So thank you for including those things and I think it’s a very good document. Thank you.

Flores: Anyone else? Okay so we decided we didn't need an amendment just to change the names ...

Wray: I ...

Flores: To the correct names and ...

Wray: I don’t think so.

Flores: Okay so then should we take a vote?

Barraza: Madam Chair I think we need a motion on the floor and I ...

Flores: Oh, I thought we’d already done ...

Barraza: And I so ...

Flores: The motion. Sorry.
Barraza: I will make that motion.
Flores: Okay.
Barraza: That we approve Resolution 15-08.
Flores: All right.
Sorg: I'll second it.
Flores: Seconded by Councilor Sorg.
Wray: Mayor Barraza.
Barraza: Yes.
Wray: Councilor Pedroza.
Pedroza: Yes.
Wray: Mr. Doolittle.
Doolittle: Yes.
Wray: Councilor Sorg.
Sorg: Yes.
Wray: Commissioner Garrett.
Garrett: Yes.
Wray: Councilor Small.
Small: Yes.
Wray: Madam Chair.
Flores: Yes. Okay. So it's passed.
MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.
7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 NMDOT Long Range Transportation Plan

Flores: So we’re on to Discussion Item 7.1: New Mexico Department of Transportation Long Range Transportation Plan. Is that going to be a presentation?

Wray: Yes Madam Chair. At this time Jolene Herrera from NMDOT will present.

Herrera: Good afternoon. I’m Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Asset Management and Planning Division. I have to just warn you all up front that I did not create this presentation. There’s a lot of animations in it so I might be kind of flipping through and if you have any questions at any time please feel free to stop me and ask as we go through.

Flores: Okay.

Herrera: Okay. So this is what we’re going to go over today in this presentation: An overview of the plan development process, the why, the how, how did we engage people, what did they tell us when we did talk to them, and then we’ll go over a little bit of how the plan is organized. We’ll go into a little bit more detail about some of the, the visions, goals, and strategies and then we’ll talk just briefly about how we plan to implement this long-range plan.

So first of all let’s talk about the plan development process. Why did we develop the plan: To provide a visionary, transparent, predictable, performance-based, and strategic framework to guide decision-making at all levels within the DOT and by New Mexico’s MPOs and RTPOs. That part is important because it means that we all work together at the same time to make sure that all of our plans are in line with each other, we don’t have any contradicting information in our plans; in fact the RTPO plans are chapters in our plan and then you know the, the MPO has their own plan but like I said we did work closely with them to make sure that everything was in line. Also we’re required to do long-range plans. It’s a requirement of Map 21, the Federal Transportation Legislation but it’s also a really good idea. How do you know where you’re going and how you’re going to get there if you don’t have a plan?

So how did we develop the plan: There were four different phases. The first phase was to look at the existing conditions and really ask, “Where are we right now?” That was a lot of data collection and assessment. We completed that phase summer of 2014. Phase Two was completed fall of 2014 and that was really to give us our strategic direction. So we know where we are now. Where do we want to go in the future? We came up with visions, goals and objectives. We talked a little bit about performance measures and the caveat on that is that we don’t
have the final rules on all our performance measures from the feds yet but we decided along with the MPOs that we’re not going to wait. We’re just going to go ahead and move forward with our planning efforts and whenever they make their performance measure rules then we’ll just have to adjust accordingly. We also looked at some different scenarios which is something new for us. We’ve never done that before so it was really interesting to, to kind of see that and incorporate it into the plan. Phase Three we, we completed winter of 2014 and that was really talking about resource allocation and got more into the alternatives analysis. And then Phase Four which is implementation, we’re in the public review/comment period right now. It ends June 26th. There’s a slide on that a little bit later but it’s really trying to get us to knowing what it’s going to take to implement all of the other things that are laid out in the plan.

We considered three planning scenarios, funding scenarios in our planning process and sort of a fourth one. I’ll talk a little bit about that. So first of all we looked at just baseline revenue. If everything stays flat for the next 40 years and we don’t have any increases or decreases how can we, how do we want to plan for that? So first of all we said, “Do we want to continue existing commitments to the extent possible?” meaning business as usual. Do we want to just keep doing what we’re doing without changing anything if revenue stays the same or do we want to focus commitments on some different types of tiers? And the tiers are basically, it’s not one tier for all modes. Each mode might have its own tier so for example Interstate 10 might be a top tier for vehicles but it’s probably not going to be a top tier for bicycles. So we did look at, at some of those different things and tried to decide where to put our money in different tiers for different modes. And then of course we looked at high revenue. Well let’s say we allow toll roads. Let’s say the gas tax increases, let’s say something happens where we get more revenue for transportation. What would we like to see happen if that were to become a reality? We would be able to meet all of our commitments existing and then achieve some goals. What are the goals that we’d want to achieve? And then we internally looked at the low revenue scenario. We didn’t vet that out through the public just because we didn’t, you know we didn’t want to scare everyone away but it is something that we looked at internally and it’s basically just, “What would we be able to achieve if the bottom fell out, if we lost a major employer, if the gas tax went down, something like that?” So we did look at that, we just didn’t want to scare anybody. And you’re not meant to be able to read these at all. We just wanted to show you that these were actually the three alternative sheets that we came up with and we handed these out at our working groups and had everybody look through them and basically it just gives you a really quick side-by-side view of what’s different between each of the different alternatives so it, the one in the middle, Alternative B that was where we looked at the tiers. The first one over, Alternative A is where we just kept everything the same, and then Alternative C was really if we got more
revenue that these are the things that we wanted to do so you could go
through and look and pick which things you liked and it was just really
easy for comparison’s sake.

How did we engage stakeholders? Well I can tell you we talked to
everybody, literally everybody. We took a top down approach meaning
that internally we had upper management on board with this process from
the very beginning. We also talked to the public. We talked to
stakeholders. We talked to all sorts of working groups. We had nine
statewide working groups that are all listed there. They were based on
various things, most of them fit around the seven national goals for
transportation and then we added a, a couple of other ones. We also had
seven regional working groups and those are in line with our RTPO
boundaries. We talked to citizens, visitors, other groups. We had an
NMDOT Coordinating Committee, Trent was on that Committee. It was
our, our DEs and above, our upper management. We had an MPO and
RTPO Coordinating Committee so all of the ideas that were coming in
from the public or any comments that, that we received from working
groups were vetted through the MPOs and RTPOs first. We also had an
interagency coordinating committee. That means that we talked to other
state agencies, we talked to BLM, we talked to everybody. That’s all I can
say. We literally talked to thousands of people during this process. We
also had a tribal coordinating committee. We had participation from all 22
tribes in the state and so that was something that is also new in this plan
versus the old plan. We didn’t have as much input from the tribes as we
needed to and so this plan we did a really good job at incorporating the
tribes into it as well.

So what did the stakeholders tell us after talking to all these
people? These are the things that they told us that were important to
them: First of all identify sustainable revenue sources and use resources
efficiently. Preserve and maintain what we already have, number two. I
think that’s been made clear that it’s the MPO’s top priority as well so
again that falls in line with our state plan. You can see a lot of the, the
things in there: Address public health and safety needs. Public health
and transportation have really kind of been kept separate and I think this
plan is the first time where we’ve started putting them together, which they
should be. There’s a lot of studies and things out there that show that
there’s a link between them so instead of ignoring it we said, “You know
what? Let’s go ahead and take a look at this and incorporate it into our
plan.” And so we did. We also heard that we need to protect and
preserve what makes New, New Mexico special. Tourism is a big part of
our economy in this state and so we had to listen to what visitors to our
state had to say as well and try to incorporate their needs into our plan as
well. There’s one more, improved data collection. That’s something that,
we always all need more data and so our plan focuses a lot on how we
can get the data that we don’t have and how we can use the data that we
do have now more efficiently.
Okay let's talk about the transportation plan. How is it organized? There's chapters. Let me get through all these. Okay. So first of all we have just a basic introduction: What is the plan meant to do, what does it tell you? We go into the challenges and opportunities which was the “where are we now?” phase that I told you about. The goals and strategies are really the meat of the plan. We have five goals in our plan and each one of them has its own strategies and actions to meet those goals and then we have a chapter on performance measures. Like I said that will probably be changing based on what Federal Highways gets to us eventually and then we have an implementation plan as sort of the very last chapter, oh and then we have appendices. This visual took a lot of people a lot of time to make and it was made this way deliberately. You can see our vision over there. That also took a lot of people a lot of time to come up with. We listened to input from our regional working groups and all of those words were chosen strategically so take a minute to read it, make sure you all agree with it. While you’re doing that if you notice how the goals are set out, we have five but Goal Number One: Operate with transparency and accountability really encompasses all of the other goals as well which is why it sort of goes around because we need to do that anyway and we need to do that with each one of our goals.

Goal Number Two is to improve safety for all system users. There is the multimodal aspect of the plan. We’re not just talking about cars, we’re talking about bikes, people walking, people on horses, motorcycles, people traveling by rail, every kind of system user you can think of.

Goal Number Three: Preserve and maintain our transportation assets for the long term. So this is something also in line with what the MPO was talking about, asset management plans. The state is working on ours. It will be part of this plan, part of the implementation I guess, part of the plan.

Goal Number Four: Provide multimodal access and connectivity for community prosperity. That one’s really important for local communities because it’s about connecting them, it really is. It’s about connecting people to where they need to go. So how do we get someone from T or C to Las Cruces to go to the hospital? Those are the kinds of questions that we tried to get to with that goal.

And then Goal Number Five: Respect New Mexico's cultures, environment, history, and quality of life. And like I said we've never really had health in our transportation plans before. Goal Number Five with the quality of life statement really starts to get to creating healthier communities through the transportation system so it’s really interesting to see that.

Let's go a little bit more into the goals and the strategies now. Okay, oops, so the first goal, transparency and accountability, these are the things that we want to work on. A lot of this is more internal. For instance the first strategy outstanding customer-focused employees, so we’re internally looking at how we can create a better workforce to serve
our, the public better and we’re also looking at how we can gain more trust from the public and support local governments where we need to. We’re looking to retain partnerships that have been created through this planning process. We’ve talked to a lot of different people. We’ve created a lot of working groups and some of them we’re looking to maintain throughout the life of this plan and then when we go on to future plans to keep those, those groups intact. And then data and information, that’s a really big emphasis area for us. I said earlier we’re looking to improve the quality of our data and we’re looking at how we can better provide that to local governments, to the public, just being better at data collection in general.

Goal Number Two: Safety for all system users. We want to have a data-driven proactive process and part of the, what we heard out of the regional working groups is people want us to be more proactive. So right, how it used to be in the past is if you wanted to spend safety money you had to have a crash and unfortunately a lot of times it had to be a fatal crash. We don’t want to do that anymore. We want to know what the issues are, where the problem places are so we can hopefully prevent that crash from happening and so part of that is going to be implementation of, of our strategic highway safety plan. It also will be in line with this plan though as well so. And then again partnership with other agencies so we want to keep and just maintain all of those partnerships that we’ve already created. Sorry for all the visualizations here.

Preservation and maintenance: This one I think you know we’ve, we’ve talked about it a lot. Trent had some really good points about what preservation and maintenance really mean but I think we’re looking at it more from implementing our transportation asset management plan so once we implement that we’ll have a very clear picture of what needs to be done on each one of our roadways. We’ll be implementing that program and so we will be looking at life cycle cost analysis our roads, probably we will be spending a lot more money on certain sections of roads but it’s just what we need to do. You’ll also probably be seeing a lot more maintenance projects like chip seals and fog seals and things, things that we haven’t done in the past to maintain our pavement over a longer lifespan.

Prioritization by tier, we talked a little bit about that just you know that different modes have different tiers so keep that in mind. Let’s see. Legacy challenges: Ensure that NMDOT can affordably meet minimum condition standards for each roadway tier. This is one that the tiers and the legacy challenges, it’s one that we’ve struggled with just because a lot of our state is rural and so we’re trying to balance I guess maintaining tiers. So just keep in mind that it’s not all about the interstates. It’s also about connecting communities as well and so that’s something that we look at really in, in these two bullets here. And then training and capacity building, that’s again more internal. We want to give our people the tools that they need to do their jobs well.
Access and connectivity, I really want to point the to the second bullet there: Strategic investment in key corridors. This sort of goes back to the tiers but again a key corridor doesn’t always mean what has the most traffic on it. It’s really about connecting places so you know the road between Silver City and Lordsburg maybe doesn’t see a whole lot of traffic but it’s, it’s needed to get those people back and forth. So that could be a, a key corridor that we invest in. It’s really just not about cars I guess is the point.

And then the last bullet there: Land use and transportation coordination. This is something that’s also been sort of talked about internally and externally but it’s never been memorialized in one of our plans so we’re doing that. We’re starting to really look at what land uses are and how we can build a better transportation system for those land uses and make sure that we’re using taxpayer money efficiently. Oh, and then changing demographics. We can’t forget that we are an aging population. We will have an older population by the time this plan runs out, 2040 and so we need to really start planning for that and how are we going to move people around, people that choose not to drive or that can’t drive that need to get to medical appointments or shopping, so that’s a, we looked at that a lot in this plan too.

And then last but not least: Respect cultures, environment, history, and quality of life. New Mexico’s a different kind of state. We don’t want to make it like every other state. We have to realize that we do have special things here that people want to come and see and so like I said we did talk to a lot of the tourist industries to ask them what we could do to better our transportation system for them but then still keep in mind the local residents. Something that I want to point to is the second bullet there. We’re not sure exactly how we’re going to implement this but it’s a very interesting concept: Require and respect local plans. So something that we heard at our regional working groups is that if a local government puts money into doing plans and has a really good idea of what they want to look like in the future, why shouldn’t we reward them for doing that? And so we’re talking about possibly trying to set aside funds to help them implement some of the projects that come out of those plans. So like I said we haven’t figured out exactly how to do that yet but it’s definitely something that we have support from upper management on. With all of the, the Viva Dona Ana efforts that have gone on it could be really beneficial for the area.

So now implementing the plan, there’s four parts to it. I’m not exactly sure what this visual is supposed to say, just that it’s a cyclical process I guess. Something that, that really is new for us is the assess thing so we’ve made these plans, we’ve put them on the shelf, some people look at them sometimes but we’ve never really looked at, “Are we meeting our goals? Are we actually able to use the strategies that we laid out?” And so we’re working on coming up with an either yearly or every other year report that says how we’re meeting the goals in our plan. So
it’s really something new for us. We’re all kind of worried and excited about it but it’s good because it’s always good to look at, “How, how do we need to change things? Maybe this strategy isn’t working for us but maybe we can tweak it a little bit.” It’s just something we’ve never looked at but we should’ve been. So that’s really different for us in this plan.

Our next steps: Right now we are in the public comment period. Here’s some dates, some of them have already passed. I just wanted to show you that we’ve been doing presentations to every single MPO and RTPO, technical committee, and board all throughout the state. We had a public meeting in Las Cruces on the third, public meeting in Albuquerque on the fourth, and in Santa Fe on the eighth. June 26th is the end of our public comment period. We hope to send the plan to our state transportation commission on July 16th to approve at least the goals and strategies and then we hope to have final approval in August for implementation of the plan October 1st with the start of Fiscal Year 2016.

Here is the website for the plan. You can read through everything. There’s also comment forms available on that same website so if you have any comments that you’d like to make please you can e-mail them in. There’s an e-mail address there. You can fill out a comment form. You can send them to me however you feel most comfortable but please get us your comments back by, by the 26th. And that’s all. I’ll go back to that so you guys can see the website there. Are there any questions?

Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Thank you. This looks really good. I, I’ve taken a quick look at it but I, I’m going to go back in there, there are, are two things that I wanted to just comment on. One is I think the idea of supporting local planning is really good. One way to help deal with the potential conflict between state plans and local plans which I think you are recognizing in, in your comments is to make sure that there’s authority and support for NMDOT to participate in local planning efforts because if you can be part of those processes by sharing information, by helping people understand how their community or their planning area fits into the larger regional and statewide system, that might avoid some of the potential conflicts. Then you got to deal with the values that, that come into play but at least everybody’s working from the same sort of ground information and I think that that might help avoid some of the awkwardness of, “Well that’s, that’s something you came up with but that’s not a great idea from the state perspective.” And I think that that also then leads into my, my second concern. I, I still am interested in how the state plan will adjust to changes in economic conditions and part of that I think, it, it’s one thing if you got a road that’s going to a, a, a community that had a small coal mine and, or, or, or some other kind of let’s say natural gas area but all of a sudden that, that is an area that, that booms in terms of economic activity. You’ve got a lot more traffic on that road so you build that road to accommodate the new traffic. You could
say, “Well we already had a, a, a place, a, a route in, in, in place before we made the changes to that road.” It’s not quite the same as the two conditions that I’ve been concerned with for Dona Ana County which have to do with the southern road and its access to the spaceport which is a state project and I still contend that, that the roadways from the north and the south to the spaceport should be part of the state system. I think leaving that up to counties to do all the maintenance when it’s potentially a major economic issue for the region is, is really, it’s inconsistent with the plan is I guess what I would say. And I think the, the same kind of thought applies to my concern with a, some kind of a bypass from Santa Teresa hooking into I-10 above Anthony because if we continue to run trucks and heavy traffic and all of the other traffic that needs to get to Santa Teresa and the border through existing communities, that’s not good for land use. That’s, there’s a lot of, lot of problems. I realize that means creating at least in part a new road. And so that, we didn’t anticipate this system that would demand, or the changes that would demand that kind of adjustment in, in our transportation system. I’ve got to think that there are other places in the state where this kind of thing comes up as well. I understand and I support the idea of eliminating the amount of state roads in your system but I don’t think that that should mean we are frozen in time forever in terms of putting in new roadways where it’s really appropriate and where there’s no other really good way to do what needs to be done in terms of protecting communities, enhancing land use, you know moving traffic and that sort of thing. So I just would, I, I’m going to look to make sure how that’s addressed. I think that the, the goals and, and the overall structure is very good and I support that. But I think these were two things that sort of jumped out at me in terms of stuff that we’re dealing with here. Thank you.

Herrera: Madam Chair. If I can just, so you bring up a really good point. I guess just to, to clarify, this plan will not have a project list in it so we’re not looking at anything like that. I guess the point I’m trying to make is we’re not excluding the possibility of new roadways being needed. We’re just trying to create a framework that says we need to look at life cycle costs and those types of things when we’re making those decisions so I think we’re sort of on the, on the same page but please feel free to, to send any comments in.

Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Madam Chair. Is there, is there a provision, I, I understand what the emphasis is and I agree with that. What I’m interested in is how we deal with the exceptions and that’s, that’s really what I’m trying to address is, is that if there’s not a way of explicitly saying in the plan that special projects for new roads or for inclusion of new roads in the state system would be considered based on X criteria or something like that. I think that it’s, it’s
important to recognize the potential for that kind of change and, and to do it as the exception. That's fine because I think the, the point is we got to take care of what we've got and we got to build those, those connections and connect our communities and all that sort of stuff but I think otherwise there's too much of a possibility as the plan is applied to misunderstand what the intent was and that it was okay to have some new roads or to make some changes in the state system. So I just, I, I think that that's a, that's really important for us and I'll work something out in terms of making sure that we get comments in.

Herrera: Okay great. Thanks.

Garrett: Thank, and thank you for your clarification.

Herrera: Thanks.

Sorg: Yeah.

Flores: Anyone else? Commissioner, or Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Thank you Madam Chair. Very good presentation by the way. This is something that some of us here on the Board here have, were part of as we started out and it's really good to see that it's coming to an end and there's going to be some real good documents to go forward on. And Commissioner Garrett thank you for bringing all that up, that was good, looking at possibilities of new ways, new things. That's good and we keep that in mind. I, although I didn't see in your presentation the word “choice” but I think you had it there throughout and that's what I'm kind of, one of the many things I'd like to emphasize is providing choices for our, our people to get from point A to point B, to go where they need to go. If you want to go from Las Cruces to Albuquerque, be nice to have a couple three different choices of getting there, flying there or taking a train or, or driving on the highway. But that's on, on a large scale but on something smaller and we try to do this in the city is provide choices with your walking, your biking, and transit, public transit, and, and then it's of course your own private vehicles. I, I, I was thinking as you were saying there of my own individual case. I'm lucky because there's one, well there's more than one but one main store that I, I can do, travel there or get there by three different ways and I've used all three. I can walk to it, I can bike my, ride my bike, and I can drive over there. It all depends on the weather and how much time I have and so those are the kind of things that you know people like to have and so I, that's what I like to encourage as we go forward: Provide as many choices as we can economically provide. Thank you Madam Chair.
Flores: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Herrera: Thanks.

7.2 NMDOT update

Flores: And we'll move on to 7.2, New Mexico DOT update.

Doolittle: Thank you Madam Chair. I just want to give, a lot of the projects that were listed under that agenda item I touched on last month but I'll go through them again real quickly. The first one, the I-10 mill and inlay from 146 to 164 we already talked a little bit about as part of the TIP. That one is currently scheduled. I would expect that you'll see some construction around spring of 2016. It's not scheduled to be bid until the end of the year but with our weather we'll just have to wait and see what happens as we get closer to that time. Second one on the list is the Union bridge replacement project. That one is currently still in a ramp-up, that one is currently still in a ramp-up/

Murphy: Sorry, am trying to get to the

Doolittle: Contractors still mobilizing in. I would expect that we'll start seeing some construction around the end of June. Again that will impact the Union, the city street underneath and I-10 over the top but again as we get closer to the project I'll start preparing schedules for more detailed discussion at these meetings. Third project on the list is the Missouri bridge. Those of you that have been through there, that contractor is working very quickly. Still we're happy with their progress. They're still working on the southbound lanes. Goal is still to be finished by Christmas so as, as we move forward I'll let you know when we get ready to switch traffic but at this point they'll continue to work on the southbound lanes. We have had a few closures on Missouri itself but I think our PIO office is doing a real good job getting those notices out to try to limit the inconveniences to the public. They're all at night so we're really trying but I've been real happy with that contractor and their progress on that project. The next one is the I-10, 133 to the 146. That is basically from Corralitos to the I-10/I-25 interchange. That one is scheduled for an August letting. We may see some work towards the end of the fall depending again on weather. The one thing I will, I would like to share with you is we recognize that there'll be some conflicts in scheduling time between that one and the Union bridge project. We actually put a note in the contract that will be no conflicts with the traffic control. We're going to require them to do all of the work basically from Corralitos as you're coming into town probably until about Motel, maybe as far as Avenida de Mesilla and then once the Union bridge finishes then they can pick up that last section up to the I-
10/I-25 interchange so we'll do everything we can to make sure that there's not confusion or conflicts between those two projects.

No, that's the Union there next to the university and the, the, underneath it's the Las Cruces, Union Road underpass, correct. So that, that whole interchange and on-ramp there's the one that we'll be doing as part of that project. The last one that we have on there is NM188 and I think Councilor Small did a really good job giving us a quick update on what's going on with that one and continue through the, through the study phase and the design phase. As we work through that I'll provide updates on that one as well. With that, that's really all the projects we have in the area. Does anybody have any questions or comments for me? I will take them now.

Flores: Councilor Sorg.

Sorg: Thank you Madam Chair. Thanks for the background music. Oh, I, I see a problem coming with the Missouri bridge project once football season starts. Is there any plans to mitigate the heavy traffic on I-25 for football games?

Doolittle: Councilor Sorg at this point the only thing that we stipulated through this entire project is that the southbound lanes will remain to two at all times.

Sorg: Oh.

Doolittle: Luckily you know if we can get, and that's kind of the reason that we started on the southbound lanes. If they can get that section built we'll actually have a wider bridge, the auxiliary lane will be in place so we'll have better access to the University interchange than we do right now.

Sorg: Good.

Doolittle: So hopefully we can get that project finished up. I'll work on trying to get some, some specific updates of when they plan on switching traffic but the way they're going right now we should be on the southbound lanes before school starts.

Sorg: Okay, very good. Thank you. That's, that's good to know. And that's all Madam Chair.

Flores: Thank you. Anyone else? All right.

7.3 Committee Training

Flores: So moving on to committee training.
Murphy: Okay Madam Chair and I apologize for the brief, as we’re trying to cue it up. We had a couple of heavy items here on the agenda so we thought we’d lighten it up but tie it together with, with the training. Some of you’ve probably seen it but I’m going to go ahead and play this committee training, that’s committee training.

VIDEO PLAYED.

Murphy: So if they could make infrastructure exciting, we could make meetings fun.

Flores: All right.

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Flores: Committee and staff comments.

Sorg: So that’s part of our training?

Flores: Was training done? Sorry.

Murphy: That, that was the training. It tied the state transportation plan and the MPO transportation plan together.

Flores: Thank you.

Murphy: We have a, a public, a public meeting coming up on our University Avenue corridor. I’m going to go ahead and pass out the flyers for that. This is the Phase A study that we have Bohannan Huston under contract for to look at bicycle/pedestrian improvements on University Avenue from Main to Highway 28. The meeting’s going to be at the Mesilla Community Center on, a week from tomorrow from 6:30 to 8.

Small: Madam Chair.

Flores: Councilor Small.

Small: Thank you Madam Chair and sorry, thank you very much Mr. Murphy. Do we know if any roundabouts are proposed, are going to be a part of this topic even in, in small, it, it might not necessarily be appropriate but I know again complimenting DOT and, and Molzen Corbin and folks for at least considering even for the Valley Drive/Highway 188 project. It, it seems important that we take every opportunity to look at, especially when something is focused on pedestrian and bicycle improvements that we consider how innovative design can impact that.
Murphy: Madam Chair, Councilor Small. I think they're at, the consultants at the initial gathering of information. That's not something that I've been aware that's been suggested to be looked at but that's certainly something we can ask them to look at.

Small: I'd, I'd be very appreciative. Thank you very much. Thank, thank you Madam Chair.

Flores: Okay. Anyone else?

Barraza: Madam Chair.

Flores: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Have these flyers already gone out Tom?

Murphy: Madam Chair, Mayor Barraza. We published these in the, it, it was published in the Sun News on Saturday. We were planning on doing another publication on I think, I think either next Tuesday or next Wednesday. They haven't figured out which day's going to be strategically the best. And we've sent them out to our master mailing list. I, I think I'm also going to be disseminating them to the public information officers through, for each of the governments.

Barraza: Okay, thank you. And just one correction, on the location at the Community Center it's Mesilla, NM not Las Cruces.

Murphy: Oh. My apologies. I did not catch.

Barraza: Yeah. And we also will go ahead and post at our regular meeting places that we do our postings, excuse me and on our website also, so.

Murphy: And it's, it'll be on the MPO website as well.

Barraza: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Flores: Thank you.

Murphy: And then the last staff comment, we passed out the, we got the update for the bicycle suitability map. We've passed it out to bike stores, to all the governments, and we've ordered plenty if you know of anybody that, that can use some to, to pass out more but we're, it was, staff, staff worked hard with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. We had a couple of intern, or student co-ops from NMSU that also worked very, very diligently on this and I, and they kept me out of it so it looks nice. They did a great job.
Flores: Did. It looks good. I already swiped an extra one.

Doolittle: Madam Chair.

Flores: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Real quick Tom on that, is, is, is this electronic at all? The reason I'm asking is Representative Gomez has been very active with some of the, he's had some bicycle issues and concerns and I would like to find a way to either mail him a copy or have this electronically so that it can be e-mailed out to him but that is certainly somebody I'd like to get it some way shape or form a copy of this to him.

Murphy: I'm not sure if, if we've gotten around to it but we do have a, it, we should have it on our website to download or we could send you the, the pdf ...

Doolittle: Okay.

Murphy: By e-mail.

Doolittle: Either, either way and I'll make sure that it gets to Representative Gomez. Thank you. That, that would be greatly appreciated.

Flores: Okay. Anyone else? Do we have any committee comments? Okay, seeing none.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Flores: We'll move on to public comment. Is there anyone in the public that would like to make a comment? Seeing none.

10. ADJOURNMENT (2:45 p.m.)

Flores: We'll move on to adjournment. Is that, did you have a comment? Oh, a motion.

Pedroza: Make a motion that we adjourn.

Flores: Okay. Do I have a second? Second by Councilor Small. Thank you. We're adjourned. We're all in favor.

Chairperson
AGENDA ITEM:
6.1 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

ACTION REQUESTED:
Review and approval by the MPO Policy Committee

SUPPORT INFORMATION:
2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Report
Two Emails from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Planner

DISCUSSION:
On June 10, 2015, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The following amendment(s) to the TIP have been requested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project &amp; Termini</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC00110</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>Doña Ana County</td>
<td>El Camino Real Rd At Intersection of Dona Ana School Road</td>
<td>Design &amp; Construction for Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>Add $42,746 per revised estimate by DAC ($3,500 in FY2016 for ROW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00250</td>
<td>2016/2018/2019</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>University Ave &amp; Triviz / I-25 Interchange</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement &amp; Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>Adding $1.2M in FY2016 for PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00270</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>US 70 / MP 149.5 – 150.8 – Spitz/Solano to I-25 Interchange</td>
<td>Capacity and Safety Study</td>
<td>New project, planning phase using State Road Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100820</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>West Mesa Road From near NM 136 to I-10, Exact termini unknown at this time</td>
<td>Phases 1C-1D to complete alternatives analysis and environmental document</td>
<td>New project phase using State Road Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00230</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>NMDOT</td>
<td>Various RR Crossings Signal Upgrades</td>
<td>Moved to FY 2020 from FY 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These amendments will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.
RESOLUTION NO. 15-09

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2016-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

The Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee is informed that:

WHEREAS, preparation of a financially constrained Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a requirement of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) (U.S.C. 23 § 450.324); and

WHEREAS, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for the planning and financial reporting of all federally funded and regionally significant transportation-related projects within the MPO Area for the specified fiscal years; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee adopted the FY 2016-2021 TIP on June 10, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the NMDOT has requested amendments to the FY 2016-2021 TIP; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its July 21, 2015 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the MPO Technical Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its August 6, 2015 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution amending the FY 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program to be approved.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization:
(I)

THAT the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Fiscal Year 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program is amended as shown in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution.

(II)

THAT the Mesilla Valley MPO’s Self-Certification, as contained in Exhibit “B”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby approved

(III)

THAT staff is directed to take appropriate and legal actions to implement this Resolution.

DONE and APPROVED this 12th day of August, 2015.

APPROVED:

__________________________
Chair

Motion By: 
Second By: 

VOTE:
Chair Flores
Vice Chair Sorg
Councillor Pedroza
Councillor Small
Commissioner Garrett
Commissioner Hancock
Commissioner Duarte-Benavidez
Mayor Barraza
Trustee Bernal
Mr. Doolittle

ATTEST: 
APPROVED AS TO FORM:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Termini</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Funds listed on TIP</th>
<th>Project total</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC00110</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>El Camino Real Rd</td>
<td>At Intersection of Dona Ana School Road</td>
<td>Design &amp; Construction for Intersection Realignment</td>
<td>$474,519</td>
<td>$517,265</td>
<td>Add $42,746 per revised estimate by DAC ($3,500 in FY2016 for ROW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00120</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>MP 149.2-149.5, Intersection of Spitz, Solano, Three Crosses</td>
<td>Intersection Realignment &amp; Improvements</td>
<td>$5,450,000</td>
<td>$5,450,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00140</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>MP 146.4 - 146.6, Intersection with 17th St</td>
<td>Install new Traffic Signal and Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00160</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NM 188 (Valley Drive)</td>
<td>MP 1 - 3, Picacho to Avenida De Mesilla.</td>
<td>Roadway Reconstruction. Includes Avenida De Mesilla from Valley to Hickory</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00230</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various RR Crossings in CLC</td>
<td>Signal Upgrades at various RR crossings</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00250</td>
<td>2016/2018/2019</td>
<td>University Avenue &amp; Triviz</td>
<td>Interchange with I-25</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement &amp; Interchange Modifications</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>$26,200,000</td>
<td>Added $1.2M in FY2016 for PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC00270</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>US 70</td>
<td>MP 149.5 - 150.8, Spitz/Solano to I-25 Interchange</td>
<td>Capacity and Safety Study</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>New project, planning phase using State Road Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100820</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>West Mesa Road</td>
<td>From near NM 136 to I-10, Exact termini unknown at this time</td>
<td>Phases 1C-1D to complete alternatives analysis and environmental document</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>New project phase using State Road Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,804,265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution 15-09 Exhibit “B”

MESILLA VALLEY MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

In accordance with 23 U.S.C. 450.334, the New Mexico Department of Transportation, and the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Las Cruces urbanized area hereby certify that the transportation planning process is addressing the major issues in the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of:


(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;

(3) Section 1101(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Pub. L. 105-178) regarding the involvement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in FHWA and FTA funded planning projects (Sec. 105(f), Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2100; 49 CFR, Subtitle A, Part 26);


(5) The provision of 49 U.S.C. Part 20 regarding restrictions on influencing certain activities; and

(6) Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506(c) and (d).

POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIR

__________________________

Date

NMDOT

__________________________

Date
Good morning Andrew,

Can you please include this email and the attachment in the upcoming BPAC, TAC, and PC meeting packets along with an action item on each agenda? I will be available at all three meetings to answer any questions the committees may have.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera  
Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2  
NMDOT South Region Design  
750 N Solano Dr  
Las Cruces, NM 88001  
O: (575) 525-7358  
C: (575) 202-4698
Hi Andrew,

I just received this email this afternoon. Do you think it would be appropriate to do a floor amendment at the BPAC tonight with this new information?

Thanks,

Jolene Herrera
Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2
NMDOT South Region Design
750 N Solano Dr
Las Cruces, NM 88001
O: (575) 525-7358
C: (575) 202-4698

Jolene,

I’m not sure what the MVMPO deadline is for getting changes into the TIP for the next Amendment, but there’s one change that needs to be made within the MVMPO region in that update.

CN LC00230, Signal Upgrades at Various RR Crossings, needs to move from year 2018 to year 2020 (the planning year) in the next update. No changes in the budget are required.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions on this.

Thanks,

Bill
Bill Craven
Rail Bureau Manager
New Mexico Department of Transportation
(505) 827-5263
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AGENDA ITEM:
7.1 NMDOT Projects Update

ACTION REQUESTED:
Update from NMDOT regarding current projects

DISCUSSION:
1100620 – I-10 Mill and Inlay Project, MP 146-164.3
1100830 – I-10 Bridge Replacement Project (Union)
LC00100 – I-25 Bridge Replacement Project (Missouri)
LC00150 – I-10 Pavement Preservation Project, MP 133-146
LC00160 – NM 188 (Valley Drive) Reconstruction Project
LC00210 – Goathill Road RR Crossing Project
LC00220 – NM 226 RR Crossing Project
AGENDA ITEM:
7.2 Taylor Road Functional Classification Discussion

DISCUSSION:
MPO Staff will present on the MPO’s role in the development and implementation of the regional Functional Classification system.